arXiv:1703.08951v1 [quant-ph] 27 Mar 2017

Quantum Memory in the Ultrastrong-Coupling Regime via Parity Symmetry Breaking

Roberto Stassi[1*] and Franco Nori[1,2]

[1] *CEMS, RIKEN, Saitama 351-0198, Japan*

[2] *Physics Department, The University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109-1040, USA*

(Dated: March 28, 2017)

Abstract

The coherence time of a quantum system is affected by its interaction with the environment. To reduce the decoherence rate T_2^{-1}, every improvement that reduces the pure dephasing rate T_φ^{-1} is limited by the longitudinal relaxation of the population, $(2T_1)^{-1}$. We show theoretically that a two-level system ultrastrongly coupled to a cavity mode can be used as a quantum memory. When the vacuum degeneracy is lifted, there is a strong suppression of the longitudinal relaxation rate. To preserve the coherence from pure dephasing, we prove it is possible to apply dynamical decoupling. We use an auxiliary atomic level to store and retrieve quantum information.

* roberto.stassi@riken.jp

I. INTRODUCTION

Superconducting circuits are one of the most promising candidates for quantum information processing as they exhibit flexibility, controllability and scalability [1, 2]. To implement quantum logic, the information should be preserved between gate operations, requiring a quantum memory (QM). The realization of a QM device, as well as of a quantum computer, is challenging because quantum states are fragile: the interaction with the environment causes decoherence. There are external, for example local electromagnetic signals, and intrinsic sources of decoherence. In the case of circuit-QED, the main intrinsic source of decoherence are fluctuations in the critical-currents, charges, and magnetic-fluxes.

The Dicke model predicts that a system of N two-level atoms interacting with a single-cavity mode, in the thermodynamic limit ($N \to \infty$) and at zero temperature ($T = 0$), after a critical value of the light-matter coupling $\lambda > \lambda_c$, is characterized by a spontaneous polarization of the atoms and a spontaneous coherence of the cavity field [3, 4]. This situation can also be encountered in the finite-N case, when the system is in the ultrastrong-coupling regime (USC), $\lambda \gg \lambda_c$ [5]. Here, we consider a single two-level atom, $N = 1$, interacting with a cavity mode in the USC regime. First, we derive a general master equation, valid for a large variety of hybrid quantum systems in the weak, strong, ultrastrong, and deep strong coupling regimes. Considering the two lowest eigenstates of our system, we show that if the coupling between the two-level atom and the cavity field is transverse and in the USC regime, the system is strongly protected against pure dephasing. Vice versa, we prove theoretically that if the coupling is longitudinal and in the USC regime, then the system is strongly protected against the relaxation of the population. Taking advantage of the relaxation suppression in the USC regime, we prove that it is possible to apply the dynamical decoupling procedure to have full protection against decoherence [6]. Moreover, with the help of an auxiliary non-interacting atomic level, providing a suitable drive to the system, a flying qubit that enters the cavity can be stored in our QM device and retrieved afterwards. In contrast to other proposals in the USC regime of circuit-QED [7, 8], we do not need asymmetric decoherence channels and we do not have limitations in the time of storage as a function of the coupling. In this treatment we neglect the diamagnetic term A^2, which prevents the appearance of a superradiant phase, as the conditions of the no-go theorem can be overcome in circuit-QED [9, 10].

II. MODEL

The Hamiltonian of a two-level system interacting with a cavity mode, is ($\hbar = 1$)

$$\hat{H} = \omega_c \hat{a}^\dagger \hat{a} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}\hat{\sigma}_z + \frac{\Delta}{2}\hat{\sigma}_x + \lambda \hat{X}\hat{\sigma}_z \,. \tag{1}$$

being $\hat{a}$ ($\hat{a}^\dagger$) the annihilation (creation) operator of the cavity mode with frequency ω_c, $\hat{X} = \hat{a} + \hat{a}^\dagger$, and $\hat{\sigma}_j$ the Pauli matrices, with $j = \{x, y, z\}$. For a flux qubit, ε and Δ correspond to the energy bias and the tunnel splitting between the persistent current states $\{|\downarrow\rangle, |\uparrow\rangle\}$ [11]. We do not apply the rotating wave approximation in the interaction term as the counterrotating terms are relevant and fundamental in the USC regime.

For $\Delta = 0$, the coupling is *longitudinal* and the two lowest eigenstates are exactly the *polarized* states $|P_\downarrow\rangle = |\downarrow\rangle|+\alpha\rangle$ and $|P_\uparrow\rangle = |\uparrow\rangle|-\alpha\rangle$, where $|\pm\alpha\rangle = \exp[\pm\alpha(\hat{a}^\dagger - a)]|0\rangle$ are displaced Fock states [12], with $\alpha = \lambda/\omega_c$. A proof of this is given in Appendix A. Hereafter, we will consider $\Delta \neq 0$. In the subspace spanned by the polarized states $P = \{|P_\downarrow\rangle, |P_\uparrow\rangle\}$, $\hat{H}$ becomes

$$\hat{H}_P = \frac{\varepsilon}{2}\hat{\sigma}_z + \frac{\Delta_{\rm R}}{2}\hat{\sigma}_x \,, \tag{2}$$

with $\Delta_{\rm R} = \Delta\langle+\alpha|-\alpha\rangle$. Equation (2) describes a two-state system, see inset in Fig. 1, characterized by a double-well potential with detuning parameter ε. The kinetic contribution $(\Delta_{\rm R}/2)\hat{\sigma}_x$ mixes the states P associated to the two minima of the potential wells.

For $\varepsilon = 0$, the coupling in Eq. (1) is *transverse* and the two lowest eigenstates of $\hat{H}$ converge, for $\lambda > \lambda_c$, to the *entangled* states $|E_-\rangle = (|P_\uparrow\rangle - |P_\downarrow\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$ and $|E_+\rangle = (|P_\uparrow\rangle + |P_\downarrow\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$. In this case, the energy difference between the eigenstates, $\Delta_{\rm R} = \Delta \exp\{-2|\lambda/\omega_c|^2\}$, converges exponentially to zero with λ, see Fig. 1 and Ref. [13]. The system described by $\hat{H}$ does not conserve the number of excitations, but for $\varepsilon = 0$ has $\mathbb{Z}_2$ symmetry and it conserves the parity of the number of excitations. For $\varepsilon \neq 0$, the parity symmetry of both the number of excitations and the potential of the artificial atom is broken [14–16]. As Δ_R converges exponentially to zero with λ, the first two eigenstates of $\hat{H}$ converge exponentially to the polarized states P, see Eq. (2) and Fig. 1. For $\varepsilon = 0$, it is also possible to break the $\mathbb{Z}_2$ parity symmetry, and have the polarized states P, applying to the cavity the constant field $-\Lambda/2\hat{X}$. In this case, the parity symmetry of the potential of the artificial atom is preserved. The energy splitting between the first two eigenstates is a function of the coupling λ; indeed, $\omega_1 - \omega_0 = 2\Lambda\lambda/\omega_c$, see Fig. 1 and Appendix A.



FIG. 1. (Color online) Energy levels for $\varepsilon = 0$ (black dotted curves), $\varepsilon = 0.2\,\omega_c$ (blue solid curves), and for $\varepsilon = 0$ applying a constant field with $\Lambda = 0.2\,\omega_c$ (red dashed curves). Here $\Delta = \omega_c = 1$. Inset: graphical representation of the potential energy of the two-level system; each well is associated to a polarized state $\{|P_\downarrow\rangle, |P_\uparrow\rangle\}$.

III. MASTER EQUATION AND COHERENCE RATE

The dynamics of a generic open quantum system S, with Hamiltonian $\hat{H}_{\rm S}$ and eigenstates $|m\rangle$, is affected by the interaction with the environment B, that we describe in terms of a bath of harmonic oscillators. The theory of relaxation and pure dephasing must be studied in the basis that diagonalizes $\hat{H}_{\rm S}$. The fluctuations that induce decoherence originate from the different channels that connect the system to the environment. For a single two-level system strongly coupled to a cavity field these channels are $\mathcal{S} = \{\hat{\sigma}_x, \hat{\sigma}_y, \hat{\sigma}_z, \hat{X}, \hat{Y}\}$, with $\hat{Y} = i(\hat{a} - \hat{a}^\dagger)$. In the interaction picture, the operators $\hat{S}^{(k)} \in \mathcal{S}$ can be written as

$$\hat{S}^{(k)}(t) = \hat{S}_z^{(k)} + \hat{S}_-^{(k)}(t) + \hat{S}_+^{(k)}(t)\,, \tag{3}$$

with $\hat{S}_-^{(k)}(t) = \sum_{m,n>m} s_{mn}^{(k)} |m\rangle\langle n|\, e^{-i\omega_{nm}t}$, $\hat{S}_+^{(k)} = (\hat{S}_-^{(k)})^\dagger$ and $\hat{S}_z^{(k)} = \sum_m s_{mm}^{(k)} |m\rangle\langle m|$, this in analogy with $\hat{\sigma}_-$, $\hat{\sigma}_+$ and $\hat{\sigma}_z$ for a two-state system [17], while $s_{mn}^{(k)} = \langle m|\hat{S}^{(k)}|n\rangle$ and $\omega_{mn} = \omega_m - \omega_n$. The interaction of the environment with $\hat{S}_z^{(k)}$ affects the eigenstates of the system, and involves the randomization of the relative phase between the system eigenstates. The interaction of the environment with $\hat{S}_x^{(k)} = \hat{S}_-^{(k)} + \hat{S}_+^{(k)}$ induces transitions between

different eigenstates. With this formulation, we have derived a master equation in the Born-Markov approximation valid for generic hybrid-quantum systems [18], at $T = 0$,

$$\dot{\hat{\rho}} = -i\left[\hat{H}_{\rm S}, \hat{\rho}\right] + \sum_k \sum_{m,n>m} \Gamma_{mn}^{(k)} \mathcal{D}\left[|m\rangle\langle n|\right]\hat{\rho} + \sum_k \gamma_\varphi^{(k)} \mathcal{D}\left[\hat{S}_z^{(k)}\right]\hat{\rho}\,, \tag{4}$$

where $\mathcal{D}[\hat{O}] = (2\hat{O}\hat{\rho}\,\hat{O}^\dagger - \hat{O}^\dagger\hat{O}\hat{\rho} - \hat{\rho}\,\hat{O}^\dagger\hat{O})/2$ is the Lindblad superoperator. The sum over k takes into account all the channels $\hat{S}^{(k)} \in \mathcal{S}$. $\Gamma_{mn}^{(k)}$ are the transition rates from level n to level m and are proportional to $|s_{mn}^{(k)}|^2$. Expanding the last term in Eq. (4), allows to prove that the pure dephasing rate is $\gamma_\varphi^{(k)}|s_{mm}^{(k)} - s_{nn}^{(k)}|^2$. For a complete derivation of the master equation, see Appendix B. Using only the lowest two eigenstates of $\hat{H}_{\rm S}$, the master equation can be written in the form $\dot{\hat{\rho}} = -i\left[\hat{H}, \hat{\rho}\right] + \sum_k \Gamma^{(k)}\mathcal{D}\left[\hat{\sigma}_-\right]\hat{\rho} + \gamma_\varphi^{(k)}\mathcal{D}\left[\hat{S}_z^{(k)}\right]\hat{\rho}$, where $\hat{\sigma}_-$ is the lowering operator. In the weak- or strong-coupling regime, it corresponds to the classical master equation in the Lindblad form for a two-state system.

IV. ANALISYS

As shown above, if the coupling is transverse, in the USC regime the two lowest eigenstates converge to the entangled states $\{|E_-\rangle, |E_+\rangle\}$ as a function of the coupling λ. If the coupling is longitudinal, the two lowest eigenstates are the polarized states P. Moreover, we proved that the relaxation of the population is proportional to $|s_{mn}^{(k)}|^2$ and the pure dephasing to $|s_{mm}^{(k)} - s_{nn}^{(k)}|^2$. In Table I we report the values of $S_{\rm R}(|E\rangle) = |\langle E_+|\hat{S}|E_-\rangle|$, $S_{\rm D}(|E\rangle) = 1/2|\langle E_+|\hat{S}|E_+\rangle - \langle E_-|\hat{S}|E_-\rangle|$ and $S_{\rm R}(|P\rangle) = |\langle P_\uparrow|\hat{S}|P_\downarrow\rangle|$, $S_{\rm D}(|P\rangle) = 1/2|\langle P_\uparrow|\hat{S}|P_\uparrow\rangle -$

TABLE I. Values of $S_{\rm R}(|E\rangle)$, $S_{\rm D}(|E\rangle)$, $S_{\rm R}(|P\rangle)$ and $S_{\rm D}(|P\rangle)$ calculated for every channel in $\mathcal{S}$.

$\hat{S}$	$S_{\rm R}(\|E\rangle)$	$S_{\rm D}(\|E\rangle)$	$S_{\rm R}(\|P\rangle)$	$S_{\rm D}(\|P\rangle)$
$\hat{\sigma}_x$	0	$\langle+\alpha\|-\alpha\rangle$	$\langle-\alpha\|+\alpha\rangle$	0
$\hat{\sigma}_y$	$i\langle-\alpha\|+\alpha\rangle$	0	$i\langle-\alpha\|+\alpha\rangle$	0
$\hat{\sigma}_z$	1	0	0	1
$\hat{X}$	2α	0	0	2α
$\hat{Y}$	0	0	0	0

$\langle P_\downarrow|\hat{S}|P_\downarrow\rangle|$, calculated for every channel $\hat{S}$ in $\mathcal{S}$. As $\langle+\alpha|-\alpha\rangle = \exp\{-2|\lambda/\omega_c|^2\}$, if the coupling is transverse, there is protection against pure dephasing; if the coupling is longitudinal, there is protection against relaxation. This complementarity is because $S_{\rm R}(|E\rangle) = S_{\rm D}(|P\rangle)$ and $S_{\rm R}(|P\rangle) = S_{\rm D}(|E\rangle)$, for $\hat{\sigma}_x$, $\hat{\sigma}_z$, $\hat{X}$, and $\hat{Y}$; while for $\hat{\sigma}_y$, they are exponentially suppressed or null.

V. DYNAMICAL DECOUPLING

The dynamical decoupling (DD) method consists of a sequence of π-pulses that average away the effect of the environment on a two-state system [19]. To protect from pure dephasing, the DD method uses a sequence of $\hat{\sigma}_x$ or $\hat{\sigma}_y$ pulses. If we rotate the $\hat{\sigma}_x$ operator in the basis given by the states P, we find that $\hat{R}\,\hat{\sigma}_x\hat{R}^{-1} = \beta^{-1}\hat{\sigma}_x$ and $\hat{R}\,\hat{\sigma}_y\hat{R}^{-1} = \beta^{-1}\hat{\sigma}_y$, with $\beta^{-1} = \langle+\alpha|-\alpha\rangle$. Therefore, $\hat{\sigma}_x$ and $\hat{\sigma}_y$ pulses in the bare atom basis correspond to $\hat{\sigma}_x$ and $\hat{\sigma}_y$ pulses attenuated by the β^{-1} factor in the basis given by the states P. To compensate the reduction, the amplitude of the pulses must be multiplied by a factor β.

VI. PROPOSAL

If we consider the polarized states P as a QM device and if we prepare it in an arbitrary superposition, we can preserve its coherence. Indeed, our QM device is naturally protected from population relaxation. To protect it from pure dephasing, we apply DD [20]. We consider $\hat{H}$ in Eq. (1) with $\varepsilon \neq 0$. In order to have the second excited states far apart in energy, we need $|\varepsilon| < 0.5\,\omega_c$. The longitudinal relaxation suppression behaves as $|\langle+\alpha| - \alpha\rangle|^2 = \exp\{-4N(\lambda/\omega_c)^2\}$; increasing the coupling λ or the number N of atoms increases exponentially the decay time of the longitudinal relaxation. However, the contribution of the $\hat{X}$ channel to pure dephasing increases quadratically with λ/ω_c. This is a small price to pay, but can be overcome adapting the DD. Figure 2 shows the numerically calculated total relaxation variation as a function of λ/ω_c and ε/ω_c. For large values of λ/ω_c and ε/ω_c, there is strong suppression of the relaxation rate, while there is a complementary behaviour for the pure dephasing rate, see Fig. 4 in Appendix C. Regarding DD, we must be careful how to choose the pulses. When the direction of the coupling is not exactly longitudinal, the convergence of the lowest eigenstates to the polarized states P is exponential respect



FIG. 2. (Color online) Contour plot in a logarithmic scale (vertical bar on the right) of the total longitudinal relaxation rate reduction versus the normalized coupling λ/ω_c and ε/ω_c. Here, $\Delta = 0.1\omega_c$, and $\omega_c = 1$.

to the coupling; thus, the $\hat{\sigma}_x$ operator in the free-atom basis is not exactly the $\hat{\sigma}_x$ operator in the reduced eigenbasis of $\hat{H}$. Indeed, the off-diagonal elements are equal to β^{-1}, while the diagonal elements converge to zero slower with λ. Instead, there are no problems with the $\hat{\sigma}_y$ operator of the bare atom, because it corresponds exactly to $\beta^{-1}\hat{\sigma}_y$ in the reduced dressed basis.

VII. PROTOCOL

Now we propose a protocol to write-in and read-out the quantum information encoded in a Fock state $|\psi\rangle = \alpha|0\rangle + \beta|1\rangle$. We write $\hat{H}$ in Eq. (1) in the basis that diagonalizes the atomic two-level system $\{|g\rangle, |e\rangle\}$,

$$\hat{H} = \omega_c \hat{a}^\dagger \hat{a} + \frac{\omega_q}{2}\hat{\sigma}_z + \lambda \hat{X}\left(\cos\theta\,\hat{\sigma}_z - \sin\theta\,\hat{\sigma}_x\right), \tag{5}$$

with $\theta = \arctan(\Delta/\varepsilon)$ and $\omega_q = \sqrt{\varepsilon^2 + \Delta^2}$. We consider an auxiliary state $|s\rangle$ decoupled from the cavity field, and with higher frequency ω_s (for large coupling, it can also be lower) respect to the two-level system $\{|g\rangle, |e\rangle\}$ [14]. Figure 3(a) shows the eigenvalues of the Hamiltonian of the total system, $\hat{H}_{\rm tot} = \hat{H} + \omega_s|s\rangle\langle s|$, versus the coupling λ/ω_c. The blue solid curves concern $\hat{H}$, the red dashed equally-spaced curves the auxiliary level $|s\rangle$ and these count the number of photons in the cavity [21]. We prepare the atom in the state $|s\rangle$ sending a π-pulse resonant with the transition frequency between the ground $|P_\downarrow\rangle$ and



FIG. 3. (Color online) Two-level system deep strongly coupled to a cavity mode and an auxiliary non-interacting level s. (a) Energy levels of $\hat{H}_{\rm tot}$ versus the normalized coupling λ/ω_c. The blue solid curves concern the interacting part; the red dashed horizontal lines concern the non-interacting part. (b) Time evolution of the fidelity $\mathcal{F}$ between the initial state $|\psi\rangle$ and $\Psi_{\rm s}(t)$ (red dashed curve), and $\Psi_{\rm P}(t)$ (blue solid curve). Here, $\omega_c = 1$, $\varepsilon = 0.3\,\omega_c$, $\Delta = 0.1\,\omega_c$, $\lambda = 1.35\,\omega_c$, $\omega_{\rm s} = 1.7\,\omega_c$. All the relaxation rates are $\gamma = 10^{-5}\omega_c$.

$|s,0\rangle$ states [22]. When the qubit with an unknown quantum state $|\psi\rangle$ enters the cavity, the state becomes $|\Psi_{\rm s}\rangle = |s\rangle \otimes (\alpha|0\rangle + \beta|1\rangle) = \alpha|s,0\rangle + \beta|s,1\rangle$. Immediately after, we send two π-pulses: p_1 resonant with the transition $|s,1\rangle \to |P_\downarrow\rangle$ and p_2 resonant with the transition $|s,0\rangle \to |P_\uparrow\rangle$. Hereafter, we apply DD to preserve the transverse relaxation rate; meanwhile the QM device is naturally protected from the longitudinal relaxation. To restore the quantum information we reverse the storage process. Figure 3(b) shows the time evolution of the fidelity $\mathcal{F}$ between the initial state $|\psi\rangle$ and the states $\Psi_{\rm s}(t) = \alpha_{\rm s}|s,0\rangle + \beta_{\rm s}|s,1\rangle$ and $\Psi_{\rm P}(t) = \alpha_\uparrow|P_\uparrow\rangle + \beta_\downarrow|P_\downarrow\rangle$ in the rotating frame. This using the master equation in Eq. (4), but neglecting the contribution from pure dephasing. The decay rates in the non-interacting

case are assumed to be the same for every channel, $\gamma = 10^{-5}\omega_c$. The pulses are described by $\hat{H}_{\rm p_1} = \epsilon(t)\cos(\omega_{\rm ab}t)(\hat{\sigma}_{\rm gs} + \hat{\sigma}^{\dagger}_{\rm gs})/\langle a|\hat{\sigma}_{\rm gs}|b\rangle$ and $\hat{H}_{\rm p_2} = \epsilon(t)\cos(\omega_{\rm ab}t)(\hat{\sigma}_{\rm es} + \hat{\sigma}^{\dagger}_{\rm es})/\langle a|\hat{\sigma}_{\rm es}|b\rangle$, where $\hat{\sigma}_{\rm es} = |e\rangle\langle s|$, $\hat{\sigma}_{\rm gs} = |g\rangle\langle s|$, $\epsilon(t)$ is a Gaussian envelope and $\omega_{\rm ab}$ is the transition frequency between the state a and b. At time $t = 0$, the states $|s, 0\rangle$ and $|s, 1\rangle$ are prepared, so that $\alpha_{\rm s}^2 = 0.75$ and $\beta_{\rm s}^2 = 0.25$. At the times $t_1 = 10^{-3}\gamma^{-1}$ and $t_2 = 2 \times 10^{-3}\gamma^{-1}$, we apply the pulses p_1 and p_2 respectively. Now the populations and the coherence are completely transferred in the polarized states P and the qubit is stored. At $t_3 = 2.7 \times 10^{-2}\gamma^{-1}$ and $t_4 = 2.8 \times 10^{-2}\gamma^{-1}$, two pulses equal to the previous ones restore the qubit $|\psi\rangle$ into the cavity.

VIII. CONCLUSIONS

We propose a quantum memory device composed of the lowest two eigenstates of a system made by a two-level atom and a cavity mode interacting in the USC regime, when the vacuum degeneracy is lifted. Making use of an auxiliary non-interacting level, we store and retrieve the quantum information. In this proposal there is no limitation in the order of the decoherence suppression; it depends on the strength of the coupling and on the performance of the DD procedure. This proposal is experimentally feasible with current technology [10, 20]. For parameters adopted in the simulation, the reduction of the longitudinal relaxation rate is 6.8×10^{-4}, meanwhile the pure dephasing rate only increases by a factor 7.3. In the future, it will be useful to probe the noise spectrum of the $\hat{X}$ and $\hat{\sigma}_x$ channels in order to find the best sequence of π-pulses to apply in the DD.

IX. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We would like to thank S. Savasta, A. Carollo and M. Cirio for useful discussions and important suggestions. This work was partially supported by: the RIKEN iTHES Project, the MURI Center for Dynamic Magneto-Optics via the AFOSR Award No. FA9550-14-1-0040, the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science (KAKENHI), the IMPACT program of JST, CREST grant No. JPMJCR1676, and a grant from the John Templeton Foundation.

Appendix A: Polarized States $\{|P_\downarrow\rangle, |P_\uparrow\rangle\}$

1. Case: $\varepsilon \neq 0$

Let us start with the Hamiltonian of a two-level system interacting longitudinally with a cavity mode

$$\hat{H} = \omega_c \hat{a}^\dagger \hat{a} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}\hat{\sigma}_z + \lambda \hat{X}\hat{\sigma}_z \,. \tag{A1}$$

If we replace $\hat{\sigma}_z$ by its eigenvalue $m = \pm 1$, we can write

$$\hat{H} = \omega_c \hat{a}^\dagger \hat{a} + m\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{2} + \hat{X}\right) . \tag{A2}$$

The transformation $\hat{a} = \hat{b} - m\lambda/\omega_c$, which preserves the commutation relation between $\hat{a}$ and $\hat{a}^\dagger$, $[\hat{b}, \hat{b}^\dagger] = 1$, diagonalizes $\hat{H}$

$$\hat{H} = \omega_c \hat{b}^\dagger \hat{b} - \frac{\lambda^2 m^2}{\omega_c} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} m \,. \tag{A3}$$

This is the Hamiltonian of a displaced harmonic oscillator. If we apply the operator $\hat{b} = \hat{a} + m\alpha$, with $\alpha = \lambda/\omega_c$, to the ground state $|0_m\rangle$ of the oscillator given by Eq. (A3), we have $\hat{a}|0_m\rangle = -m\alpha|0_m\rangle$. We now see that $|-m\alpha\rangle = |0_m\rangle$ is a coherent state with eigenenergy

$$E_m = -\lambda^2 m^2/\omega_c + m\varepsilon/2 \,. \tag{A4}$$

Therefore, the two lowest eigenstates of the Hamiltonian $\hat{H}$ in Eq. (A1) are the two states $|P_\downarrow\rangle = |\downarrow\rangle|+\alpha\rangle$ and $|P_\uparrow\rangle = |\uparrow\rangle|-\alpha\rangle$, with eigenvalues $E_\pm = -\lambda^2 m^2/\omega_c \pm \varepsilon/2$. The energy split between the eigenstates is $E_+ - E_- = \varepsilon$. The number of photons contained in each state is $n = |\alpha|^2 = \lambda^2/\omega_c^2$.

2. Case: $\varepsilon = 0$

The polarized states can be generated also substituting in Eq. (A1) the term $\varepsilon\hat{\sigma}_z/2$ with the field $-\frac{\Lambda}{2}\left(a + a^\dagger\right)$

$$\hat{H} = \omega_c \hat{a}^\dagger \hat{a} + \lambda\left(\hat{a} + \hat{a}^\dagger\right)\hat{\sigma}_z - \frac{\Lambda}{2}\left(a + a^\dagger\right) . \tag{A5}$$

Following the same procedure as before, we can write

$$\hat{H} = \omega_c \hat{a}^\dagger \hat{a} + \left(\hat{a} + \hat{a}^\dagger\right)\left(m\lambda - \frac{\Lambda}{2}\right), \tag{A6}$$

that we diagonalize with the transformation $\hat{a} = \hat{b} - (m\lambda - \Lambda/2)/\omega_c$,

$$\hat{H} = \omega_c \hat{b}^\dagger \hat{b} - \frac{\left(m\lambda - \frac{\Lambda}{2}\right)^2}{\omega_c} \,. \tag{A7}$$

The excited state is now $|P_\uparrow\rangle = |\uparrow\rangle|-\alpha\rangle$ with energy $E_+ = -\frac{(\Lambda/2-\lambda)^2}{\omega_c}$ and the ground state is $|P_\downarrow\rangle = |\downarrow\rangle|+\alpha\rangle$ with energy $E_- = -\frac{(\Lambda/2+\lambda)^2}{\omega_c}$, and $-m\alpha = -(m\lambda - \Lambda/2)/\omega_c$. The energy difference between the excited and the ground state is $E_+ - E_- = 2\lambda\Lambda/\omega_c$.

Appendix B: Master equation for a generic hybrid system

The total Hamiltonian that describes a generic hybrid system interacting with the environment B is

$$\hat{H} = \hat{H}_S + \hat{H}_B + \hat{H}_{SB} \,, \tag{B1}$$

with $\hat{H}_{SB} = \sum_k \hat{H}_{SB}^{(k)}$, where the sum is over all the channels k that connect the system S to the environment. In the interaction picture we have

$$\hat{S}^{(k)}(t) \;=\; \sum_{mn} s_{mn}^{(k)} |m\rangle\langle n| \, e^{i\omega_{mn}t} \;=\; \hat{S}_z^{(k)} + \hat{S}_-^{(k)}(t) + \hat{S}_+^{(k)}(t) \;, \tag{B2}$$

with $\hat{S}_z^{(k)} = \sum_m s_{mm}^{(k)} |m\rangle\langle m|$, $\hat{S}_-^{(k)}(t) = \sum_{m,n>m} s_{mn}^{(k)} |m\rangle\langle n| \, e^{-i\omega_{nm}t}$, and $\hat{S}_+^{(k)} = (\hat{S}_-^{(k)})^\dagger$, this in analogy with $\hat{\sigma}_z$, $\hat{\sigma}_-$, $\hat{\sigma}_+$ for a two-state system [17], where $s_{mn}^{(k)} = \langle m|\hat{S}^{(k)}|n\rangle$ and $\omega_{mn} = \omega_m - \omega_n$. The interaction of the environment with $\hat{S}_z^{(k)}$ affects the eigenstates of the system, and involves the randomization of the relative phase between the system eigenstates. The interaction of the environment with $\hat{S}_x^{(k)} = \hat{S}_-^{(k)} + \hat{S}_+^{(k)}$ induces transitions among different eigenstates. We use the Born master equation in the interaction picture

$$\dot{\hat{\rho}}_I = -\frac{1}{\hbar^2} \sum_k \int_0^t dt' \, tr_B \left\{ \left[\hat{H}_{SB}^{(k)}(t) \,, \left[\hat{H}_{SB}^{(k)}(t') \,, \hat{\rho}_I(t') \, \hat{B}_0 \right] \right] \right\} \tag{B3}$$

where $\hat{B}_0$ is the density operator of the bath at $t = 0$.

1. Relaxation

Within the general formula for a system S interacting with a bath B, in the rotating wave approximation, the Hamiltonian $\hat{H}_{SB}$ is

$$\hat{H}_{SB}^{(k)}(t) = \hat{S}_-^{(k)}(t)\hat{B}^\dagger(t) + \hat{S}_+^{(k)}(t)\hat{B}(t) \tag{B4}$$

with $\hat{B}(t) = \sum_p \alpha \hat{b}_p e^{-i\nu_p t}$, where α is the coupling constant with the system operator $\hat{S}^{(k)}$. We assume that the bath variables are distributed in the uncorrelated thermal mixture of states. It is easy to prove that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\langle \hat{B}(t)\hat{B}(t')\rangle_B = 0\,, \\
&\langle \hat{B}^\dagger(t)\hat{B}^\dagger(t')\rangle_B = 0\,, \\
&\langle \hat{B}^\dagger(t)\hat{B}(t')\rangle_B = \sum_p \alpha^2 \exp\{i\nu_p(t-t')\}\bar{n}(\nu_p,T)\,, \\
&\langle \hat{B}(t)\hat{B}^\dagger(t')\rangle_B = \sum_p \alpha^2 \exp\{-i\nu_p(t-t')\}[1+\bar{n}(\nu_p,T)]\,,
\end{aligned} \tag{B5}$$

where $\bar{n} = (\exp\{\frac{\hbar\nu_p}{k_B T}\}-1)^{-1}$, k_B is the Boltzmann constant, and T is the temperature. Using Eq. (B4) and the properties of the trace, substituting $\tau = t - t'$, Eq. (B3) in the Markov approximation becomes ($\hbar = 1$)

$$\begin{aligned}
\dot{\hat{\rho}}_I = &\sum_k \sum_{(m,n>m)} \sum_{(m',n'>m')} s^{(k)}_{mn} s^{(k)}_{n'm'} \left(|n'\rangle\langle m'|\rho_I|m\rangle\langle n| - |m\rangle\langle n|n'\rangle\langle m'|\rho_I\right) \\
&\times e^{i(\omega_{n'm'}-\omega_{nm})t} \int_0^t d\tau\, e^{-i\omega_{n'm'}\tau} \langle \hat{B}^\dagger(t)\hat{B}(t-\tau)\rangle_B \\
+ &\sum_k \sum_{(m,n>m)} \sum_{(m',n'>m')} s^{(k)}_{m'n'} s^{(k)}_{nm} \left(|m'\rangle\langle n'|\rho_I|n\rangle\langle m| - |n\rangle\langle m|m'\rangle\langle n'|\rho_I\right) \\
&\times e^{i(\omega_{nm}-\omega_{n'm'})t} \int_0^t d\tau\, e^{i\omega_{n'm'}\tau} \langle \hat{B}(t)\hat{B}^\dagger(t-\tau)\rangle_B \\
+ &\sum_k \sum_{(m,n>m)} \sum_{(m',n'>m')} s^{(k)}_{m'n'} s^{(k)}_{nm} \left(|n\rangle\langle m|\rho_I|m'\rangle\langle n'| - \rho_I|m'\rangle\langle n'|n\rangle\langle m|\right) \\
&\times e^{i(\omega_{nm}-\omega_{n'm'})t} \int_0^t d\tau\, e^{i\omega_{n'm'}\tau} \langle \hat{B}^\dagger(t-\tau)\hat{B}(t)\rangle_B \\
+ &\sum_k \sum_{(m,n>m)} \sum_{(m',n'>m')} s^{(k)}_{mn} s^{(k)}_{n'm'} \left(|m\rangle\langle n|\rho_I|n'\rangle\langle m'| - \rho_I|n'\rangle\langle m'|m\rangle\langle n|\right) \\
&\times e^{i(\omega_{n'm'}-\omega_{nm})t} \int_0^t d\tau\, e^{-i\omega_{n'm'}\tau} \langle \hat{B}(t-\tau)\hat{B}^\dagger(t)\rangle_B\,.
\end{aligned} \tag{B6}$$

Within the secular approximation, follows that $m' = m$ and $n' = n$. We now extend the τ integration to infinity and in Eq. (B5) we change the summation over p to an integral, $\sum_p \to \int_0^\infty d\nu\, g_k(\nu)$, where $g_k(\nu)$ is the density of states of the bath associated to the operator $\hat{S}^{(k)}$, for example

$$\int_0^t d\tau\, e^{-i\omega_{nm}\tau} \langle \hat{B}^\dagger(t)\hat{B}(t-\tau)\rangle_B \to \int_0^\infty d\nu\, g_k(\nu)\, \alpha^2(\nu)\, \bar{n}(\nu,T) \int_0^\infty d\tau\, e^{i(\nu-\omega_{nm})\tau}\,. \tag{B7}$$

The time integral is $\int_0^\infty d\tau\, e^{i(\nu-\omega_{nm})\tau} = \pi\delta(\nu-\omega_{nm}) + i\mathcal{P}/(\nu-\omega_{nm})$, where $\mathcal{P}$ indicates the Cauchy principal value. We omit here the contribution of the terms containing the Cauchy principal value $\mathcal{P}$, because these represent the Lamb-shift of the system Hamiltonian. We arrive to the expression

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{\hat{\rho}}_I = \pi \sum_k \sum_{m,\,n>m} & |s_{mn}^{(k)}|^2 \alpha^2\left(\omega_{mn}\right) g_k\left(\omega_{mn}\right) \big(2|n\rangle\langle m|\rho_I|m\rangle\langle n| \\ & - |m\rangle\langle n|n\rangle\langle m|\rho_I - \rho_I|m\rangle\langle n|n\rangle\langle m|\big)\bar{n}\left(\omega_{mn},T\right) \\ + \pi \sum_k \sum_{m,\,n>m} & |s_{mn}^{(k)}|^2 \alpha^2\left(\omega_{mn}\right) g_k\left(\omega_{mn}\right) \bar{n}\left(\omega_{mn},T\right) \big(2|m\rangle\langle n|\rho_I|n\rangle\langle m| \\ & - |n\rangle\langle m|m\rangle\langle n|\rho_I - \rho_I|n\rangle\langle m|m\rangle\langle n|\big)\left[\bar{n}\left(\omega_{mn},T\right)+1\right] ,\end{aligned} \tag{B8}$$

as $s_{nm}^{(k)} = (s_{mn}^{(k)})^*$. Transforming back to the Schrödinger picture, we obtain the master equation for a generic system in thermal equilibrium

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{\hat{\rho}} = -i\left[\hat{H}_S,\hat{\rho}\right] + \sum_k \sum_{m,\,n>m} & \Gamma_{mn}^{(k)} \mathcal{D}\Big[|n\rangle\langle m|\Big]\hat{\rho}\left(t\right)\bar{n}\left(\omega_{mn},T\right) \\ + \sum_k \sum_{m,\,n>m} & \Gamma_{mn}^{(k)} \mathcal{D}\Big[|m\rangle\langle n|\Big]\hat{\rho}\left(t\right)\left[\bar{n}\left(\omega_{mn},T\right)+1\right]\end{aligned} \tag{B9}$$

where $\Gamma_{mn}^{(k)} = 2\pi|s_{mn}^{(k)}|^2\alpha^2\left(\omega_{mn}\right) g_k\left(\omega_{mn}\right)$ is the transition rate from level m to level n.

2. Pure dephasing

A quantum model of the pure dephasing describes the interaction of the system with the environment in terms of virtual processes; quanta of the bath with energy $\hbar\nu_q$ are scattered to quanta with energy $\hbar\nu_p$, leaving the states of the system unchanged. In the interaction picture we have

$$\hat{H}_{SB}^{(k)} = \hat{S}_z^{(k)}(t)\,\hat{B}(t) \tag{B10}$$

with $\hat{B}\left(t\right) = \sum_{pq}\alpha\,\hat{b}_p^\dagger\,\hat{b}_q\,e^{i\nu_{pq}t}$, where α is the coupling constant with the system. In the sum, terms with $p=q$ have nonzero thermal mean value and they will be included in $\hat{H}_S$, producing a shift in the Hamiltonian energies, so we will omit this contribution. Substituting

Eq. (B10) in the Born master equation Eq. (B3), with $\tau = t - t'$

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{\hat{\rho}}_I = \sum_k \sum_{m,m'} s^{(k)}_{m,m} s^{(k)}_{m',m'} \Big[\Big(|m'\rangle\langle m'|\rho_I|m\rangle\langle m| - |m\rangle\langle m|m'\rangle\langle m'|\rho_I \Big) \\ \times \int_0^t d\tau \langle B\,(t)\, B\,(t-\tau)\rangle_B \\ + \Big(|m\rangle\langle m|\rho_I|m'\rangle\langle m'| - \rho_I|m'\rangle\langle m'|m\rangle\langle m| \Big) \\ \times \int_0^t d\tau \langle B\,(t-\tau)\, B\,(t)\rangle_B \Big].\end{aligned} \tag{B11}$$

The correlation function becomes

$$\langle B\,(t)\, B\,(t-\tau)\rangle_B = \sum_{p,q\neq p} \alpha^2 \hat{n}_p\,(1+\hat{n}_q)\, e^{i(\nu_p-\nu_q)\tau}\,. \tag{B12}$$

As before, we now extend the τ integration to infinity and in Eq. (B12) we change the summation over p and q with the integral, $\sum_p \to \int_0^\infty d\nu_p\, g_k(\nu_p)$, for example

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_0^t d\tau\, \langle \hat{B}^\dagger(t)\hat{B}(t-\tau)\rangle_B \to \\ &\int_0^\infty d\nu_p d\nu_q\, g_k\,(\nu_p)\, g_k\,(\nu_q)\, \alpha^2\,(\nu)\, \bar{n}\,(\nu_p,T)\,[1+\bar{n}\,(\nu_q,T)] \int_0^\infty d\tau\, e^{i(\nu_p-\nu_q)\tau}\,.\end{aligned} \tag{B13}$$

The time integral is $\int_0^\infty d\tau\, e^{i(\nu_p-\nu_q)\tau} = \pi\delta(\nu_p-\nu_q) + i\mathcal{P}/(\nu_p-\nu_q)$. We omit here the contribution of the terms containing the Cauchy principal value $\mathcal{P}$, they must be included in the Lamb-shifted Hamiltonian. Transforming back to the Schrödinger picture, we obtain the pure dephasing contribution to the master equation for a generic system in thermal equilibrium

$$\dot{\hat{\rho}} = \sum_k \gamma^{(k)}_{\rm deph} \mathcal{D}\left[\sum_m s^{(k)}_{mm} |m\rangle\langle m|\right] \rho \tag{B14}$$

with $\gamma^{(k)}_{\rm deph} = 2\pi \int_0^\infty d\nu\, \alpha^2(\nu) g_k^2(\nu) \bar{n}(\nu,T)\,[1+\bar{n}(\nu,T)]$.

Using Eq. (B9) and (B14), we obtain the master equation valid for generic hybrid-quantum systems in the weak-, strong-, ultra-strong coupling regime, with or without parity symmetry.

Appendix C: Total pure dephasing rate variation

Figure S1 shows the numerically calculated total pure dephasing rate variation as a function of λ/ω_c and ε/ω_c. For large values of λ/ω_c, the strong suppression of pure dephasing

rate is confined to a region that exponentially converges to zero when λ/ω_c. Therefore, for large value of the coupling λ, fluctuations in ε drive the entangled states $\{|E_-\rangle, |E_+\rangle\}$ to the polarized states $\{|P_\downarrow\rangle, |P_\uparrow\rangle\}$.



FIG. 4. (Color online) Contour plot in a logarithmic scale (vertical bar on the right) of the total pure dephasing rate reduction versus the normalized coupling λ/ω_c and ε/ω_c. Here, $\Delta = 0.1\omega_c$, and $\omega_c = 1$.

[1] J.Q. You and F. Nori, "Atomic physics and quantum optics using superconducting circuits," Nature **474**, 589–597 (2011).

[2] I. Buluta, S. Ashhab, and F. Nori, "Natural and artificial atoms for quantum computation," Reports on Progress in Physics **74**, 104401 (2011).

[3] C. Emary and T. Brandes, "Chaos and the quantum phase transition in the Dicke model," Phys. Rev. E **67**, 066203 (2003).

[4] C. Emary and T. Brandes, "Phase transitions in generalized spin-boson (Dicke) models," Phys. Rev. A **69**, 053804 (2004).

[5] S. Ashhab and F. Nori, "Qubit-oscillator systems in the ultrastrong-coupling regime and their potential for preparing nonclassical states," Phys. Rev. A **81**, 042311 (2010).

[6] M.J. Biercuk, A.C. Doherty, and H. Uys, "Dynamical decoupling sequence construction as a filter-design problem," J. Phys. B: At., Mol. Opt. Phys. **44**, 154002 (2011).

[7] P. Nataf and C. Ciuti, "Protected quantum computation with multiple resonators in ultrastrong coupling circuit QED," Phys. Rev. Lett. **107**, 190402–5 (2011).

[8] T.H. Kyaw, S. Felicetti, G. Romero, E. Solano, and L. C. Kwek, "Scalable quantum memory in the ultrastrong coupling regime," Sci. Rep. **5**, 8621–5 (2015).

[9] P. Nataf and C. Ciuti, "No-go theorem for superradiant quantum phase transitions in cavity QED and counter-example in circuit QED," Nat. Commun. **1**, 72 (2010).

[10] F. Yoshihara, T. Fuse, S. Ashhab, K. Kakuyanagi, S. Saito, and K. Semba, "Superconducting qubit-oscillator circuit beyond the ultrastrong-coupling regime," Nat. Phys. **13**, 44–47 (2017).

[11] J.E. Mooij, T.P. Orlando, L. Levitov, L. Tian, C.H. Van der Wal, and S. Lloyd, "Josephson persistent-current qubit," Science **285**, 1036–1039 (1999).

[12] E.K. Irish, J. Gea-Banacloche, I. Martin, and K.C. Schwab, "Dynamics of a two-level system strongly coupled to a high-frequency quantum oscillator," Phys. Rev. B **72**, 195410–14 (2005).

[13] P. Nataf and C. Ciuti, "Vacuum degeneracy of a circuit QED system in the ultrastrong coupling regime," Phys. Rev. Lett. **104**, 023601 (2010).

[14] Y.X. Liu, J.Q. You, L.F. Wei, C.P. Sun, and F. Nori, "Optical selection rules and phase-dependent adiabatic state control in a superconducting quantum circuit," Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 087001–4 (2005).

[15] F. Deppe, M. Mariantoni, E.P. Menzel, A. Marx, S. Saito, K. Kakuyanagi, H. Tanaka, T. Meno, K. Semba, H. Takayanagi, *et al.*, "Two-photon probe of the jaynes–cummings model and controlled symmetry breaking in circuit qed," Nat. Phys. **4**, 686–691 (2008).

[16] L. Garziano, R. Stassi, A. Ridolfo, O. Di Stefano, and S. Savasta, "Vacuum-induced symmetry breaking in a superconducting quantum circuit," Phys. Rev. A **90**, 043817 (2014).

[17] H. Carmichael, *An open systems approach to quantum optics*, Lecture Notes in Physics Monographs, Vol. 18 (Springer, 1991).

[18] F. Beaudoin, J. M. Gambetta, and A. Blais, "Dissipation and ultrastrong coupling in circuit QED," Physical Review A **84**, 043832 (2011).

[19] L. Viola and S. Lloyd, "Dynamical suppression of decoherence in two-state quantum systems," Phys. Rev. A **58**, 2733–2744 (1998).

[20] J. Bylander, S. Gustavsson, F. Yan, F. Yoshihara, K. Harrabi, G. Fitch, D.G. Cory, Y. Nakamura, J.S. Tsai, and W.D. Oliver, "Noise spectroscopy through dynamical decoupling with a superconducting flux qubit," Nat. Phys. **7**, 565–570 (2011).

[21] R. Stassi, A. Ridolfo, O. Di Stefano, M. J. Hartmann, and S. Savasta, "Spontaneous conversion from virtual to real photons in the ultrastrong-coupling regime," Phys. Rev. Lett. **110**, 243601

(2013).

[22] O. Di Stefano, R. Stassi, L. Garziano, A.F. Kockum, S. Savasta, and F. Nori, "Cutting Feynman loops in ultrastrong cavity QED: stimulated emission and reabsorption of virtual particles dressing a physical excitation," arXiv preprint arXiv:1603.04984 (2016).